

### REMARKS

This communication is responsive to the Advisory Action dated November 13, 2003. A Request for Continued Examination is filed herewith. A Notice of Appeal was filed on September 5, 2003 and received by the PTO on September 8, 2003.

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1, 6-9, 11 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nochumson et al., claims 1-5, 11, 12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by White, and claims 3, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nochumson et al. in view of Hagen et al. or Hilderbrandt et al.

The Examiner did not find Applicant's arguments persuasive for the reason that the term "adhered to the housing" does not necessarily mean not removable from the housing.

By the accompanying amendment, claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite that the structure is chemically adhered to the interior wall of the housing. Support for the amendment can be found in the paragraph bridging pages 9 and 10, and at page 12, second full paragraph.


As admitted by the Examiner, the filter in Nochumson et al. is held in place by centrifugal pressure during operation. It is not chemically adhered to the interior wall of the housing as now recited in the instant claims as amended.

Also as admitted by the Examiner, the filter in White is held in place by friction (i.e., it is force fit in the housing.). It is not chemically adhered to the interior wall of the housing as now recited in the instant claims as amended.

Claims 3, 10 and 13 are believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence, for the reasons articulated above. Neither Hagen et al. nor Hilderbrandt et al. disclose or suggest chemically adhering the membrane to an interior wall of a housing.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kevin S. Lemack  
Reg. No. 32,579  
176 E. Main Street – Suite 7  
Westboro, Massachusetts 01581  
TEL : (508) 898-1818